

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending. Claims 1, 15, 25 and 26 have been amended.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a)

Claims 1-4, 10-13 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2002/0091990 (“Little”). Claims 5-9 and 14-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Little in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,223,343 (“Hopwood”). Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

The Present Invention

The present invention is directed to an approach to software development that starts at a much higher level of business process abstraction than traditional approaches to business software development, such as the Rationale Rose-based system described in Little. Indeed, as described in paragraphs 0010 and 0011 of the Background of the Invention section of the instant application, while the use of “use cases” and “object models” in systems like that described in Little provides “a useful abstraction [that] allow[s] the software developer to create software with a view toward specific situations that the software will be expected to handle,” such “use cases still have the drawback of being, in many situations, at a much lower level of abstraction than the requirements for which the software is designed.” What the present invention does differently is to begin the process of software development at a much higher level of abstraction.

As described in paragraph 0031 of the instant specification, a company can be defined by the set of processes that take place within it. For example, an airline performs a process of receiving a reservation over the Internet, as well as a process of receiving luggage at a check-in counter and transporting it to the appropriate plane. Some of the processes, such as the receipt of a reservation over the Internet, may benefit from a high degree of automation by business software. Other processes, such as moving luggage from the check-in counter to the airplane, cannot easily be automated by business software, because, for example, they must

be performed manually. Nevertheless, it is helpful to define all the processes of a company and the interrelationships between them.

According to the present invention, “blueprints” are used to define the business processes of a company and the interrelationships between them. As expressly defined in the instant specification a “blueprint” is “a collection of documents, called artifacts, that can be used to create a cross-referenced representation of the business processes that occur within an enterprise (Spec, ¶ 0034).” In the interests of advancing prosecution, the applicants have amended each of the independent claims 1, 15, 25 and 26 to more expressly recite that the claimed “blueprints” comprise information relating to a particular industry and provide “a cross-referenced representation of business processes that occur within the enterprise.” Once such “blueprints” have been created, certain business processes may be selected for automation using a business software solution. The artifacts for the business processes to be automated can be used as a guide for a programmer to create the business software solution. And because the blueprints describe the interrelationships between business processes, a change to a business process can be propagated throughout the business software solution by following the cross-references to other processes that are provided in the artifacts of the changed process. These features are not disclosed in Little.

Little Does Not Teach or Suggest “Blueprints” As Now Claimed

The “use cases” and “object models” of Little are **not** “blueprints” that comprise information relating to a particular industry and that “*provide[] a cross-referenced representation of business processes that occur within the enterprise,*” as now expressly recited in the each of independent claims 1, 15, 25 and 26 (emphasis added). A “use case” is an instance of a use of a software solution by an actor. It merely describes how one actor will interact with the software in a particular instance, hence the term “use case.” Unlike the claimed “blueprints,” a “use case” simply does not provide a cross-referenced representation of business processes that occur within an enterprise. Indeed, as mentioned above, the present invention employs “blueprints” of business processes in an attempt to overcome the disadvantages of the “use cases” and “object models” of Little. Because Little does not teach or suggest this aspect of the claimed invention, reconsideration of the Section 102(e) and 103 rejections of claims 1, 15, 25 and 26 is respectfully requested.

Little Also Does Not Teach or Suggest “Providing Documentation” As Claimed

With respect to the claimed feature of “providing documentation” in independent claims 1 and 15 and “recording documentation” in claim 25, the Office Action responds to the applicants’ prior arguments by referring again to the following statement in paragraph [0145] of Little: “A use case diagram provides a functional specification of a system and its major processes, and describes the problem that needs to be solved” (Office Action, p. 12). According to the Office Action, the “Examiner interprets this [description] to be *providing documentation*” (*Id.*)(emphasis added). But there is no explanation of how this statement teaches or suggests that the provided documentation “*specifies a relationship between at least two functional components, thereby enabling traceability between the at least two functional components,*” as recited in claim 1 or the similar recitations in claims 15 and 25 that the documentation “*specifies a traceable relationship between ... the one or more functional components*” (emphasis added). The applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action has not given proper weight to the highlighted language of these claims. Reconsideration of the Section 102(e) and 103 rejections of claims 1, 15 and 25 is requested for this additional reason.

For all the foregoing reasons, the applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 15, 25 and 26 patentably define over Little, whether alone or in combination with any of the other cited art of record. Hopwood does not cure the deficiencies of Little. Moreover, inasmuch as the remaining claims depend either directly or indirectly from one of those independent claims, the applicants submit that they too patentably define over the cited art of record.

DOCKET NO.: BB012A (USYS-0203)
Application No.: 10/731,846
Office Action Dated: October 18, 2007

PATENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and arguments presented above, the applicants respectfully submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance.

Date: December 18, 2007

/Steven B. Samuels/
Steven B. Samuels
Registration No. 37,711

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439

Correspondence address:
Richard J. Gregson, Esq.
Unisys Corporation
Unisys Way
Blue Bell, Pennsylvania 19424-0001